

Remarks

Claim Amendments

Claim 60 has been amended. Claims 61-67 have been cancelled. Claims 68-72 have been added. Reference to page numbers will be made to the pages of PCT publication, WO2005/037235. Newly added claims 68 and 69 find basis throughout the specification, more particularly on page 3, paragraph 10, page 13, paragraph 58 and following Figure 31 in the PCT specification, the page numbered 1 which provides the CDR amino sequences of antibodies disclosed in the specification. Support for claim 70 can be found throughout the specification, more particularly on page 18, paragraph 72. Support for claims 71 and 72 can be found throughout the specification, more particularly on page 21, paragraph 82 and on page 22, paragraph 88.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claim 67 is rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as indefinite. In view of the current amendments to the claims, Applicant submits that the rejection is moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Enablement

Claims 65 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as lacking enablement. In view of the current amendments, Applicant submits that the rejection is moot and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 66 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Although Applicant does not concede that claim 66 lacks enablement, to expedite prosecution, claim 66 has been cancelled. As such, the rejection is moot and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph, Written Description

Claim 67 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In view of the current amendments and the cancellation of claim 67, Applicant submits this rejection is moot and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection. For completeness, however, Applicant would like to draw the attention of the Examiner to original claim 39, which provides basis for cancelled claim 66.

Claim Objections

Claim 60 and 61 are objected to because of informalities. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that claim 60 recites “An purified. . .” instead of “A purified. . . .” In addition, claim 61 is objected to as it depends from an objected claim. Applicant submits that the current amendments have addressed the Examiner’s concerns. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the foregoing in an effort to advance this application towards allowance, the Examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alejandro Martinez/
Alejandro Martinez
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,163
Phone: 317-277-4260

Eli Lilly and Company
Patent Division
P.O. Box 6288
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6288

November 8, 2010